

EXHIBIT D

Case Studies:

LexisNexis® Accurint® for Law Enforcement



LexisNexis Accurint for Law Enforcement is a proven and effective tool already used by over 4,000 federal, state and local law enforcement agencies across the country.

Real crimes. Real results.

Learn from actual law enforcement scenarios how LexisNexis® Accurint® for Law Enforcement can help your department or agency:

- Maximize budget and resources.
- Enhance officer safety.
- Solve cases faster.
- Reduce crime rates.

Accurint for Law Enforcement is a proven and effective tool already used by over 4,000 federal, state and local law enforcement agencies across the country. Solve cases more quickly by leveraging the power of next-generation search technology that enables you to quickly gather and analyze comprehensive and current information from the LexisNexis® catalog of public records.

- Locate people and apprehend suspects.
- Discover associations.
- Uncover assets.
- Investigate businesses.
- Visualize complex relationships.
- Map locations.

Case Study #1: Fugitive Location

LexisNexis Accurint for Law Enforcement identified the location of a fugitive who had fled a jurisdiction. Accurint succeeded where AutoTrackXP® failed.

On September 29, 1985, in a local bar in a major California city, several men became involved in a fight that escalated into a shooting. As a result, a 25-year old man was killed that evening. While a suspect was identified and a warrant was quickly issued, the suspect evaded capture and remained at large for 23 years.

Over a period of several years, homicide detectives made numerous attempts to locate the suspect using a variety of department resources, including the AutoTrackXP public records tool. Several times a year, officers from the unit checked these resources without success.

In early September 2008, officers entered the suspect's name into the LexisNexis Accurint for Law Enforcement product and immediately located him at an address in Las Vegas. On September 18, 2008, the suspect was taken into custody by the Las Vegas Police Department. According to the California detective on the case, the suspect would "no doubt still be free today if it were not for Accurint."

Case Study #2: Suspect Location

An Accurint relative search leads to subject's location.

During a lengthy investigation in 2008, a known "smurfer" of pseudoephedrine purchases picked up pills and transported them to a clandestine methamphetamine laboratory. Using vehicle information, a search was conducted on Accurint for Law Enforcement and relatives of the "smurfer" were quickly identified. Locating the suspect through his relatives not only led to his arrest, but also to the raid of the drug manufacturing laboratory.

By the Numbers

Suspect Location

Identification could have required surveillance across several locations and over several precursor drug pickups to identify possible associates.

Number of Investigators:	4 detectives
Hours Per Tour:	8 hours each
Surveillance Hours:	8 hours each x 4 = 32 hours
Standard:	8 hours each x 4 = 32 hours
Overtime:	16 hours each x 4 = 64 hours

32 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$1,152 salary

32 hours OT x \$54.00 per hour = \$1,728 OT disbursements

Potential Cost: \$2,880

Actual Cost: Under one hour, one detective = \$36.00

Estimated Savings: \$2,844

Case Study #3: Witness Location

A single Accurint for Law Enforcement search saves several days and thousands of dollars.

In September 2007, while conducting an Accurint for Law Enforcement demonstration for the Suffolk County Police Department in Yaphank, New York, a homicide squad detective requested up-to-date information on a potential hostile witness from a 10-year-old homicide investigation.

Using conventional police sources, the detective had obtained a current address for the witness in Florida. All necessary travel arrangements were made for the detective and a partner. The trip was to take place within the next two weeks. The purpose of the trip was to interview and potentially obtain an incriminating statement from the witness against the primary suspect in the case. The detective felt confident he had accurate residential information on the witness and was utilizing this request to gauge the validity of the Accurint data.

An Accurint check on the witness verified that the address previously obtained by the detective was the witness' most recent address. However, the Accurint check also revealed that the witness was deceased. The listed date of death was approximately four months prior. As a result the homicide squad commander directed the detective to verify the death with the appropriate recording county and subsequently cancelled the excursion of the two detectives to Florida.

By the Numbers**Witness Location**

This abortive operation could have cost the Suffolk County Police Department as much as \$4,200 in salary, overtime and travel expenses.

Investigative Period:	3 days
Number of Investigators:	2 detectives
Hours Per Tour:	8 hours each
Tours Worked (3 days):	3 tours each x 2 = 6 tours
Overtime:	8 hours each x 2 = 16 hours
Total Hours:	32 hours each x 2 = 64 hours

48 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$1,728 salary
 16 hours OT x \$54.00 per hour = \$864 OT disbursements
 Cost Savings: \$2,592

Travel Expenses:	
Airfare:	2 tickets @ \$400 each = \$800
Lodging (2 nights each):	\$238 x 2 = \$476
Meals:	\$210
Rental Car:	\$125
Total Travel:	\$1,611

Total Savings: \$4,203

Case Study #4: Suspect Location**Accurint for Law Enforcement could have saved time, resources and money in a double homicide case.**

Just after midnight on January 1, 1996, an unidentified male entered the lobby of 99 Tompkins Avenue in Brooklyn, New York, and shot and killed two males. Later that day, the detectives felt they had developed a promising lead—a possible subject only known as “Chris” who lived on “Tompkins.” Unfortunately, no further information was available.

The detectives quickly searched all internal databases for persons—specifically, those who had been arrested—with the name “Chris,” and persons with a “Tompkins” address. The current tools did not allow for that combination to be queried simultaneously, resulting in an extensive list of possibilities. A tremendous number of man hours were spent analyzing thousands of records.

By the next day, an additional lead was developed by detectives that indicated that the assailant also had a sister by the first name “Monique.” Again, the internal law enforcement databases did not allow at that time—nor do they today—for a first name, street address and relative name query. As a result, detectives were then assigned to canvass the neighborhood in search of a shooter by the name “Chris” who lived on “Tompkins” and had a sister named “Monique.” After combing the area for two weeks, on January 15, 1996, the detectives finally developed enough information to place a suspect into a photo array. It was at this point that the photo lineup was shown to all four witnesses involved in the investigation, but a positive identification was not made. Further investigation revealed that the investigators had identified the correct individual, but that the witnesses were reluctant to make the identification due to the fact that they had all been visited by “friends” of the suspect. Some were threatened; some were paid off.

Turn the clock forward, and today an Accurint Advanced Person Search utilizing first name “Chris,” address “Tompkins,” and relative first name “Monique” would have resulted in one record—the correct suspect.

If that search capability was available and utilized at the time, "Chris" would have been positively identified within two days of the homicide, leaving a very short window for his associates to visit any of the suspects. Early identification would have resulted in interviews of the witnesses being conducted prior to tampering, and most likely, a quick arrest.

By the Numbers

Suspect Location

Four detectives spent 13 days attempting to manually track down a suspect.

Investigative Period:	January 2 - January 15 (13 Days)
Number of Investigators:	4 detectives
Hours Per Tour:	8 hours each
Tours Worked (13 days):	9 tours each x 4 = 36 tours
Overtime:	8 hours each x 4 = 32 hours
Total Hours:	72 hours each x 4 = 288 hours

288 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$10,368 salary

32 hours OT x \$54.00 per hour = \$1,728 OT disbursements

Potential Cost: \$12,096

Actual Cost: Under one hour, one detective = \$36.00

Estimated Savings: \$12,060

Case Study #5: Asset Identification

Accurint for Law Enforcement can be used to identify assets for seizure.

In early 2008, police were investigating a 28-year-old male for possible involvement in a predatory lending scheme. His business was quickly identified as being involved and a quick Accurint search revealed his personal assets, including a \$150,000 sports car. These assets were seized, the business involved in the consumer fraud was shut down and the suspect was arrested.

Case Study #6: Officer Safety, Critical Incidents and Civil Litigation

Accurint for Law Enforcement can link residents and relatives to addresses to better assess the risk of approaching that location.

Serving a drug search warrant on a residence in Northern California, an officer was involved in a fatal double shooting. An unknown occupant of the residence shot and killed one of the officers on the scene and wounded another. The shooter was shot and killed by the remaining officers. The officers did not know when they visited the house that the shooter was a relative of the main resident, had a history of disturbed behavior and was armed. The police were also unaware that neighbors had seen the shooter with a handgun and witnessed him shooting it as he rambled about, expressing paranoia toward police. As a result of this information, the family of the shooter sued the agency, and rather than going to court, the agency settled for \$300,000.

Accurint for Law Enforcement could have possibly revealed the unknown relative in the residence as well as the neighbors. Subsequently, the state mental health, criminal history and firearms ownership databases could have been searched. Had the officers been aware of these extenuating circumstances, they would have taken a more cautionary approach in serving the warrant.

By the Numbers**Asset Identification**

Asset identification is traditionally completed by as many as four officers carrying out field surveillance. Using this scenario, the costs could have come in at over \$2,800.

Number of Investigators:	4 detectives
Hours Per Tour:	8 hours each
Surveillance Hours:	8 hours each x 4 = 32 hours
Standard:	3 hours each x 4 = 12 hours
Overtime:	16 hours each x 4 = 44 hours

32 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$1,152 salary

12 hours OT x \$54.00 per hour = \$648 OT disbursements

Total spend on asset identification = \$1,800

Search Warrant Issuance:

Number of Detectives:	7 detectives
Hours Per Detective:	4 hours each
Total Hours:	4 hours each x 7 = 28 hours
28 hours x \$36.00 per hour =	\$1,008
Total Spent On Warrant Issuance:	\$1,800

Potential Cost: \$2,808

Actual Cost: Under one hour, one detective = \$36.00

Estimated Savings: \$2,772

Case Study #7: Victim Identification and Location

Accurint for Law Enforcement helped detectives quickly identify and locate the victim of a robbery so that a juvenile suspect could be charged before the end of his six-hour detention period.

Two patrol officers stopped a juvenile on the street for smoking. They found his pockets stuffed with jewelry and hand-held electronics, which they assumed were stolen. They brought him to the station. Since juvenile detentions (arrests) must be completed within six hours, the victim(s) had to be located within that timeframe.

One of the items the juvenile had in his possession was a digital camera. There was a photo in it that was blown up and a license plate of a car parked in the background was revealed. The registered address of the vehicle was then obtained from the DMV.

An analyst used the Relatives section of the Accurint report to locate a sister of the registered owner of the vehicle. The sister provided a phone number for the resident, along with notifying the detective that she was babysitting for the resident's two boys. One of the boys verified that an electronic device found on the juvenile belonged to him. Everything that was stolen was recovered and it took only 45 minutes from the time the detective was notified.

As important as the cost savings, the crime was cleared in an accelerated time of less than an hour, a potential burglary pattern was interrupted and a complete recovery of the items stolen was achieved.

By the Numbers**Victim Identification**

Two detectives would have waited at the victim's home for someone to return.

Number of Investigators: 2 detectives
 Surveillance Hours: Up to 8 hours
 16 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$576

Potential Cost: \$576

Actual Cost: Under one hour, one detective = \$36.00

Estimated Savings: \$540

Case Study #8: Sex Offender Registration**Officers locate a non-compliant sex offender through an associate identified with Accurant for Law Enforcement.**

In September 2008, officers were searching for a fugitive with prior convictions, including rape and sexual abuse of a 13-year-old girl. He had failed to register his address with authorities. His associate's girlfriend was found in Accurant for Law Enforcement, and was located and surveilled. Her movements led to the fugitive and his arrest.

By the Numbers**Sex Offender Registration**

Investigative identification of the fugitive's relatives and associates would have required an investigator to search arrest and court records to locate the girlfriend and other associates, and then initiate the necessary surveillance.

Investigative Period: 8 hours
 Number of Investigators: 1 detective
 Total Hours: 8 hours

8 hours x \$36.00 per hour = \$288 salary

Potential Cost: \$288

Actual Cost: Under one hour, one detective = \$36.00

Estimated Savings: \$252

For more information:

Call 866.242.1440 or visit
lexisnexis.com/accurintle

About LexisNexis Risk Solutions

LexisNexis Risk Solutions (www.lexisnexis.com/risk) is a leader in providing essential information that helps customers across all industries and government predict, assess and manage risk. Combining cutting-edge technology, unique data and advanced scoring analytics, we provide products and services that address evolving client needs in the risk sector while upholding the highest standards of security and privacy. LexisNexis Risk Solutions is part of Reed Elsevier, a leading publisher and information provider that serves customers in more than 100 countries with more than 30,000 employees worldwide.

Our government solutions assist law enforcement and government agencies with deriving insight from complex data sets, improving operational efficiencies, making timely and informed decisions to enhance investigations, increasing program integrity, and discovering and recovering revenue.



The LexisNexis Accurint for Law Enforcement services are not provided by "consumer reporting agencies," as that term is defined in the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq.) ("FCRA") and do not constitute "consumer reports," as that term is defined in the FCRA. Accordingly, the LexisNexis Accurint for Law Enforcement service may not be used in whole or in part as a factor in determining eligibility for credit, insurance, employment or another purpose in connection with which a consumer report may be used under the FCRA. Due to the nature of the origin of public record information, the public records and commercially available data sources used in reports may contain errors. Source data is sometimes reported or entered inaccurately, processed poorly or incorrectly, and is generally not free from defect. This product or service aggregates and reports data, as provided by the public records and commercially available data sources, and is not the source of the data, nor is it a comprehensive compilation of the data. Before relying on any data, it should be independently verified. LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Accurint is a registered trademark of LexisNexis Risk Data Management Inc. Other products and services may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective companies. Copyright © 2011 LexisNexis. All rights reserved. NXR01053-2 1211